



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

brated than known, and the founder of the new Romano-Germanic empire has found more panegyrists than historians." However this may be, the subject, like all great subjects, will never be exhausted, and, excellent as the work of any decade may be, the changed conditions and new lights of the next decade are sure to clarify the old subject and require new adjustments. No apology is, therefore, necessary when any student, after careful and protracted study, chooses to impress his individuality upon the results of his work and give them to the world.

Mr. Wells proposed to be, not a panegyrist, but a historian. He has, consequently, in most of the points chosen for elucidation, made himself familiar with the original sources, and with the literature on the period down to modern times. Naturally he has derived much benefit from Mombert's standard work on Charles the Great. The result was that he found himself in a right position properly to interpret his material.

While he says that he has put the main stress on the political side of the subject, it can be truthfully said that his treatment of the religious and educational sides is very satisfactory, so that his book will be of great service to the church historian. For instance, his extensive treatment of the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals will be especially welcome. But political, ecclesiastical, and intellectual elements are so blended in this period that no discussion is possible without giving large attention to them all.

It was the purpose of the author to let the sources speak for themselves. The reader will, therefore, be prepared to find numerous and lengthy quotations all through the volume. The selections seem to have been judiciously made, and so he has secured, not only greater vividness, but, what is more important, greater accuracy.

We regard this book as one of the best, if not the best, in the uneven series of which it forms a part.

J. W. MONCRIEF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

MARTIN LUTHER IN KULTURGESCHICHTLICHER DARSTELLUNG. Von ARNOLD E. BERGER. Zweiter Teil. Erste Hälfte, 1525-1532. Berlin: Ernst Hofmann & Co., 1898. Pp. xiv+299. M. 2.40; bound, M. 3.80.

IN this first part of his second volume Berger has been very successful in carrying out his original design of showing Luther's rela-

tionship to the common culture of his day. He first takes up the weakening of the Reformation forces through the differing territorial and social conditions under which they existed, showing Luther's connection with the German conditions. Then, in a short chapter, he considers the relationship between Luther and Zwingli. This is in some respects the most unsatisfactory part of his volume. The key to his treatment of these two great reformers may be found in the following sentence: "Luther's religion was of a thoroughly individualistic, Zwingli's of a socialistic type" (p. 33). This difference he tries to trace to a difference in social environment, but in making good this distinction, and in establishing its historical origin, he has no little difficulty.

In the third chapter Berger takes up the sacramentarian controversy. He looks upon this dispute as inevitable. "That it caused them to forget completely," he says, "the common ground on which both disputants stood, and raised the division into a more passionate separation than the facts seemed to warrant, was less grounded in the nature of the controversy itself than in the strong individuality of the opponents, and so it came about that neither of them had any understanding of the exegetical and dogmatical foundation of the other" (p. 90). There is great justice in Berger's position on this matter, and the advantage of a history of theological disputes by a historian of literature here becomes apparent. Luther and Zwingli had different practical and social problems to contend with, and no doubt this is the reason they drifted apart. Even the theological historian must be impressed with the fact that in this matter it is not Luther who is speaking, but certain conditions and consequences of the Reformation, which the man who once had cared only for the truth, regardless of consequences, had not foreseen, and now feared. If at any time in his life the great German reformer can be explained and accounted for in the circumstances of his time (and this is the object of Berger's work), it is right here.

The fourth chapter is on the division of the church. Here our author takes up three topics, namely, (a) "The Reformation as a Factor in European Politics," (b) "The Division of the Reformation Interests," and (c) "The Entrance of the Reformation on its Churchly Epoch." Here he is on his favorite ground, and has many very suggestive passages in his book. He has carried on very successfully the labors of Kolde, and no book we have ever seen has brought out so clearly the relationship between the religious and the social and economical

problems of the Reformation period. We shall await with interest the appearance of the second half of this volume, which is to be on "Luther and the German Culture."

GEORGE H. FERRIS.

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

GESCHICHTE DES KÖNIGREICHES JERUSALEM (1100-1291). Von REINHOLD RÖHRICHT. Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xxviii+1105. M. 30.

CERTAINLY no one else is so well qualified to write the history of the kingdom of Jerusalem as Herr Röhricht. For many years it has been his hobby. Numerous books, pamphlets, and articles from his pen, and especially the "Regesta" of the kingdom, which he published in 1893, have given ample proof of his mastery of the subject. His diligence and perseverance have been remarkable, burdened as he has been with the duties of a *Gymnasiallehrer*. He complains, too, that not all the sources were within his reach; but it can be safely asserted that his work will need little revision, so thorough is his acquaintance with the sources at hand and so careful has been his use of them.

The headings of the chapters are somewhat unsatisfactory, being simply the dates of the period covered in the chapter, but the author has in part atoned for this by prefixing to the book a full table of contents and adding three adequate indexes. If anything is lacking to the book, it is, perhaps, a chapter or two on the life, manners, and customs of the kingdom. Innumerable details bearing on this subject are, of course, scattered throughout the book; but a subject so unique and interesting might well have found separate treatment, to the great advantage of the whole work. Herr Röhricht has followed out in all its details the political life of the crusading states and has thereby laid bare all the petty meannesses, selfishness, jealousy, corruption, and short-sighted policy of their rulers. He has shown that, although their position was a difficult one, placed as they were among their political and religious enemies, the Christians in the East really brought their fate upon themselves. They followed no wise and well-defined policy steadily, but led a hand-to-mouth existence, with little or no understanding of the larger political and social problems pressing upon them, the proper solution of which would have prolonged their existence. They had no common cause, but each princelet sought his own interests, often at the expense of a neighboring princi-